UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/895,094	07/16/97	PARULSKI	K	69998DMW

LMC1/0608

THOMAS H CLOSE
PATENT LEGAL STAFF
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON,A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2712	13

DATE MAILED: 06/08/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
08/855044	Darufski
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
Harrington	2712

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3·21·01.

☒ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 32-51 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s)_____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s)_____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 32-51 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s)_____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s)_____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on_____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on_____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11 9(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)_____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received:_____.

Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)._____

☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Other_____

Office Action Summary

DETAILED ACTION

This case has been transferred to Examiner Harrington's docket. Please address all future correspondence to Examiner Harrington.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection of the newly added claims 32-5.1

The following rejection was necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 32-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pape (US 4,819,059) in view of Ueda (US 5,923,816).

Regarding claim 32, Ueda discloses a color video recorder comprising an image sensor (CCD;12)which outputs all pixel signals which are amplified, pre processed (18) and then fed to two processing routes, in one embodiment. Motion image are selected and output through (20 and 22) one processing channel and still images are processed and output through(24;26, digital memory for storing still information-28,32) another processing channel. The still image data is

processed and stored to provide an high resolution still (more data for per image) interleaved with the moving images. Both, processing channels are input to a multiplex for interleaving the motion and still image data which can be displayed on single display or multiple displays(see figure 5) via further processing to provide a separate lower resolution motion and higher resolution still (col. 4, lines 45-61;col. 5, lines 45-51; see figure 1 and 5; col. 7,lines 1-35; also see figure 6; col. 7, lines 35-70 as another embodiment). Although, Pape discloses still images and motion images may be displayed simultaneously, Pape fails to specifically disclose the a still image is captured while previewing the motion images. Although, it is well known in the art, as taught by Ueda.

Ueda disclose a camera system which also records motion and still images where upon imitation of a button (14) a still image is recorded while the motion images are being displayed. The still image can also be displayed (col. 4,lines 26-67 and col. 5, lines 8-11). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature in Pape, as taught by Ueda, such that still images can be recorded without interrupting motion image processing and review, as taught by Ueda.

As for claim 33, see Examiner notes in claim 32.

As for claim 35, see Examiners notes in claim 32. Although, Pape discloses processing the image signal after storing the signal, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to process the images signals before storing, as it appears the system would work equally as well with storing before processing.

As for claim 36-37, the motion image signals are processed and displayed in digital format(see figure 5,col. 7,lines 11-5-10 and 33-35)

As for claim 38, Pape discloses displaying a digital image. Ueda discloses displaying analog images. Therefor, display an analog or digital signal would depend on your type of output monitor and would have been obvious matter of design choice.

As for claim 40, see Examiner notes in claim 32. In addition, Pape fails to specifically disclose a JPEG compressor for still image data. Ueda discloses compressing still image data before recording on tape but also fails to specifically disclose using JPEG. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to compress the still image data before storing ,as claimed , to increase the storing capacity of data in the memory. The Examiner takes official notice that it notoriously well known in the art to compress still images using a JPEG compression algorithm. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use JPEG compression in the systems of Pape and Ueda, as it an well known industry compression standard for still images.

As for claim 41, Pape discloses the digital memory may be any conventional medium (col. 4,lines 17-19. Thus it would have been obvious to include a removable memory card, which would increase the storing capacity of the system.

Claims 42,43,45-48, 50-51 are substantially equivalent to the claims 32,33, 35-38 and 40-41 discussed above. For sake of brevity, please see discussion and analysis of the claims above.

As for claims 34 and 44, Pape and Ueda fails to specifically discloses the processor are combined into a singe integrated circuit. However, Pape and Ueda disclose the claimed invention

except for the integrated processing circuit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an integrated processing circuit, since it has been held that forming one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. In addition, the Examiner takes official notice that a integrated circuit used to perform several procession and control functions in a camera is notoriously well known in the art.

As for claims 39 and 49, see Examiner notes in claim 34 and 44. Also, each imaging system , Pape and Ueda, have controllers which are run by programmed instruction/software. The implementation of signal processing in a single integrated circuit which is further designed to run algorithms/software to process image data would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as such implementation is commonly called microprocessors. This microprocessor is also be able to upload (from the firmware memory) software for image processing instruction. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to include a firmware memory and integrated circuit in camera for image processing, as it would not require any extraordinary expense as microprocessors are readily available on the camera market . Such camera systems incorporating these parts, are also re-programmable, which adds versatility to the camera system.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Parulski (US 4,876,590) discloses a low resolution verifier for a still image.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Harrington whose telephone number is (703) 308-9295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiners supervisor, Wendy Garber, can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communication, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

AMH:

June 1, 2000

Wendy Garber
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700